REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 21 have been amended as indicated above in accompaniment of a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. The amendments to the claims are supported at least by the text of the Application at page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 2, as well as page 11, lines 5-18, as originally filed. The Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the telephone discussing the disposition of this case with Applicant's representative. During the telephone communication, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the cited art, as well as their respective viewpoints regarding the "global" and "local" screening sections and the respective screens of each of the subject matter. Applicant and the Examiner were in disagreement regarding the level of distinction of the screening sections, which the Examiner regarded as nominal. Applicant acknowledges receipt of the corresponding Interview Summary dated August 28, 2006.

While the Applicant believes that the claim amendments submitted herewith are unnecessary, such amendments are made in the spirit of cooperation and to advance prosecution of the present matter.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-12, 16-21 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by David Scott and Richard Sharp, Abstracting Application-

Level Web Security, May 7-11, 2002 (hereinafter, "Scott").

The Claims

Claim 1 (as amended) recites a method, comprising:

- receiving data input through a web page from a client device;
- referencing a declarative module to determine a client input security screen to apply to the data input from the client device, wherein **the declarative module comprises:**
- **a global section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to any type of client input value; and**
- **an individual values section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to a particular type of client input value; and**
- applying multiple client input security screens to the data input from the client device, including at least one client input security screen from the global section of the declarative module and at least one client input security screen from the individual values section of the declarative module, wherein the client input security screens are distinct from one another, and wherein **one or more predetermined symbols are removed without replacement from the data input.**

(Emphasis added.)

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Scott. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection for anticipation is invalid and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, Scott fails to provide that <u>one or more predetermined symbols are removed without replacement from the data input</u>, as positively recited by the subject matter of this claim, as amended.

Specifically, Scott provides for HTML security policies and techniques,

based upon the use of <u>Constraints</u> (e.g., parameter name "p1" must be of type "int", etc.), and <u>Transformation rules</u> (e.g., predetermined meta-characters to be replaced by their respective numerical representations - a procedure referred to as HTML-Encode, etc.). (Pages 4-6 of Scott). Scott further states that:

> "For this reason, we adopt the convention that *all* parameters are HTML-encoded unless explicitly specified otherwise in the security policy." (Page 6 of Scott) (Emphasis theirs).

Thus, Scott contemplates an operation wherein all *meta-characters* within the respective *parameters* of a user input are <u>*replaced*</u> with their corresponding numerical representations. Therefore, each meta-character is <u>replaced</u> with some representative value. However, such a replacement operation is not the same as <u>removing, **without replacement**, one or more predetermined symbols from the data input</u>, as recited by the subject matter of claim 1, as amended. Thus, Scott fails to provide at least one feature as positively recited by the subject matter of this claim.

Furthermore, Scott is completely lacking a <u>declarative module that comprises a global section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to any type of client input value</u>, and <u>an individual values section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to a particular type of client input value</u>, as further recited by the subject matter of claim 1. The immediately foregoing deficiency of Scott has been argued previously in the prosecution of this matter and is not reiterated here in the interest of brevity.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of Scott, the Applicant contends that the § 102 rejection against claim 1 (as amended) is unsupportable and must be

10

withdrawn. The Applicant asserts that claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

Claims 4-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as well as for their own respectively patentable subject matter.

Claim 12 (as amended) recites a system, comprising:

- a web page server unit configured to provide one or more web pages to one or more client devices over a distributed network;
- means for receiving client input data;
- **a declarative module configured to include multiple client input security screens that declare screening rules for client input, wherein the declarative module comprises:**
- **a global section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to all types of client input; and**
- **an individual values section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to specified types of client input; and**
- a client input security screening unit configured to apply the screening rules for client input to the client input data and to perform one or more actions on invalid client input data, wherein the screening rules are from distinct client input security screens from the global section and the individual values section, and wherein **the client input security screening unit is further configured to remove without replacement one or more predetermined symbols from the client input data.**

(Emphasis added.)

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Scott. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection for anticipation is invalid and should be withdrawn.

Further, Scott fails to provide a system (or anything else), wherein the client input security screening unit is further configured to remove without

11

replacement one or more predetermined symbols from the client input data, as positively recited by the subject matter of this claim, as amended.

Specifically, Scott further fails to provide a declarative module configured to include multiple client input security screens that declare screening rules for client input, wherein the declarative module comprises a global section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to all types of client input, and an individual values section that includes one or more client input security screens that are applied to specified types of client input, as positively recited by the subject matter of claim 12.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of Scott, and for reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the Applicant asserts that the § 102 rejection of claim 12, as amended, is unsupportable and should be withdrawn. The Applicant asserts that claim 12 (as amended) is allowable.

Claims 16-20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as well as for their own respectively patentable subject matter.

Claim 21 (as amended) recites one or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

- serving a web page to a client over a distributed network;
- receiving client input via the web page;
- comparing the client input with multiple and distinct client input security screens stored in a security declarative module, wherein **the security declarative module includes a global section configured to screen all types of client input values and an individual values section configured to screen particular types of client input values**;
- if invalid client input is detected, performing a screening action on the invalid client input as indicated by the security declarative

12

module; and

- wherein the client input security screens included in the security declarative module can be applied to multiple web pages; and
- **wherein one or more predetermined symbols are removed without replacement from the client input.**

(Emphasis added.)

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Scott. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection for anticipation is invalid and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, Scott fails to provide for any method or means, <u>wherein one or more predetermined symbols are removed without replacement from the client input</u>, as positively recited by the subject matter of this claim.

Further, Scott fails to provide that <u>the security declarative module includes a global section configured to screen all types of client input values and an individual values section configured to screen particular types of client input values</u>, as positively recited by the subject matter of claim 21, as amended.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of Scott, and for reasons analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the Applicant asserts that the § 102 rejection of claim 21, as amended, is unsupportable and should be withdrawn. The Applicant asserts that claim 21 (as amended) is allowable.

Claims 24-28 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, as well as for their own respectively patentable subject matter.

13

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256